



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 10**

1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900  
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

OFFICE OF  
ECOSYSTEMS, TRIBAL AND  
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

June 23, 2015

**MEMORANDUM**

**SUBJECT:** The Wetlands Program Development Grant (WPDG) review of FY2015 proposals

**FROM:** Becky Fauver, Coordinator  
Wetland Program Development Grants

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Becky Fauver", is written over the printed name and title.

**TO:** Linda Anderson-Carnahan, Acting Director  
Office of Ecosystems, Tribal and Public Affairs

The Wetlands Program Development Grant (WPDG) review team met for the review of fiscal year 2015 proposals. The WPDG Request for Proposals (RFP) operates on a biennial cycle, meaning this RFP included FY15 and estimated FY16 funds and will be conducted every other year. The review team consisted of Tracy DeGering, Gayle Martin, Tracie Nadeau, and Linda Storm as reviewers and Becky Fauver as panel chair responsible for coordinating the review process and moderating the consensus meetings. Twenty-three proposals were submitted this year, with requests for federal assistance totaling \$3,405,258 for FY15 and FY16 funds. Twelve proposals were received from tribes, eight from state agencies, two from local governments or local government consortia, and one from a university which is an agent of the state. All of the submitted proposals met the threshold criteria and therefore all 23 proposals were reviewed by the review team. Available funds under the WPDG for 2015 are \$1,054,875 and we are estimated \$1,053,000 for FY2016. A funding rescission for FY15 STAG funds was announced before the final recommendation list was complete. The rescission guidance states that all FY15 awards must be unilaterally rescinded by about 0.6%. We are recommending 16 proposals for funding.

**Background**

Under the FY15 competition, applicants were divided into Track 1 and Track 2. The RFP stated that a majority of funding is to be allocated to Track One; however the selection team had the option of redistributing funding based on the quantity and quality of proposals received.

Track 1 was limited to State and Tribal applicants carrying out actions from approved Wetland Program Plans (WPPs) or those seeking to develop a WPP. To date Region 10 has approved 12 WPPs. Track 2 consisted of all other eligible applicants who sought funding for activities from the wetland program's *Core Elements Framework*. A majority of applications this year fell under Track 2. Projects ranged from improving historical mapping efforts to building a website to transfer wetland maps and information. Track 1 applicants were states and tribes who sought funding for the development of WPPs along with other grant eligible activities or, if a WPP was already approved, for grant eligible activities to develop their wetland programs. It was determined, that R10 would create a baseline funding limit for the development of WPPs in an effort to reinforce the importance of long term regional planning.



Printed on Recycled Paper

### **Review and Selection Process**

The review panel chair reviewed each proposal for eligibility then assigned each of four reviewers with 75% of the proposals to review such that each proposal would be reviewed by three reviewers which is the required minimum under the competition guidance. The review team individually scored each of their assigned proposals using the enclosed evaluation criteria which was provided within the RFP. These scores were submitted to the review panel chair and each reviewer's scores were ranked. Proposals were separated into Track 1 and Track 2 and organized in order of the average rank among the four reviewers. The team held two consensus meetings, one for Track 1 proposals and one for Track 2 proposals. The consensus process for each Track is described below:

#### **Track 1 Consensus Meeting:**

- As stated in the RFP, Track 1 proposals are the national priority and therefore the majority of funding was designated to Track 1 proposals. The team reviewed and discussed the strengths and weaknesses of Track 1 proposals based on the evaluation criteria. As the reviewers discussed each criteria of each proposal, the reviewers had the opportunity to adjust their initial score and documented the change in score on their review sheets, per the competition guidance. These adjusted scores are reflected in the final ranking order for proposals.
- After the strengths and weaknesses for each proposal were discussed and the revised scoring ranking was determined, the team analyzed the requests for funding relative to the available Track 1 funding and determined the funding amounts for each proposal. With the majority of the funding allocated for Track 1, the team recommends ten of the thirteen Track 1 proposals for full funding.
- After accounting for the funding of ten of the thirteen Track 1 proposals, there was a balance of approximately \$57,000. The panel decided that two options exist, either partially fund one of the remaining Track 1 proposals or move the funding to the Track 2 allocation.

#### **Track 2 Consensus Meeting:**

- Next, the team discussed strengths and weaknesses of the track two proposals. After a thorough discussion of all Track 2 proposals, the team unanimously decided not to fund the four proposals that ranked the lowest among all the reviewers. These proposals were either out of scope of the WPDG program, did not develop or refine a wetland program, or were not written well to use the scoring criteria to evaluate them.
- Among the remaining proposals, the review team determined which components of each proposal were in line with the agency's and the region's priorities. With many deserving proposals in Track 2, the review panel decided to move the remaining balance of Track 1 funding allocation to Track 2 which would allow for funding of more proposals. After thorough discussion of the remaining proposals, one proposal was determined to be a good candidate for partial funding to fund the portion of the work most in line with the WPDG priorities.

- Lastly, the team took into account the geographic distribution of funds, the diversity of projects, the availability of funds, and the similarity of the project to other projects already being funded by EPA to make the final funding recommendation decisions.

The team decided to fund the selected projects because the work described will help the applicants more effectively protect, restore, and manage their wetland resources.

The proposals that were not selected for funding either did not rank high in the overall evaluation process (e.g., meet certain review criteria), the work was out of the scope of the WPDG goals, the work was for ineligible actions under the RFP, or the team was not confident based on the proposal that the applicant could successfully complete the proposed work.



According to the processes described above and based on available funding, the team selected the following 16 out of the 23 reviewed proposals. The table includes the FY15 rescission estimates:

Applicant	Track	Type	Total	FY15	FY15 with rescission*	FY16
<b>Alaska</b>						
Chilkat Indian Village	1	Tribe	\$114,564.00	\$57,626.00	\$57,248.15	\$56,938.00
Alaska Natural Heritage Program	2	State	\$100,209.00	\$50,448.50	\$50,117.71	\$49,760.50
<b>Idaho</b>						
Idaho Department of Fish and Game	1	State	\$137,000.00	\$68,844.00	\$68,392.59	\$68,156.00
Coeur d'Alene Tribe	2	Tribe	\$90,000.00	\$45,344.00	\$45,046.68	\$44,656.00
<b>Oregon</b>						
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribes of Indians	1	Tribe	\$36,748.00	\$18,718.00	\$18,595.27	\$18,030.00
Oregon DSL	1	State	\$348,647.00	\$174,667.50	\$173,522.22	\$173,979.50
Siletz Tribes	1	Tribe	\$50,000.00	\$25,344.00	\$25,177.82	\$24,656.00
Lane Council of Governments	2	Local	\$144,054.00	\$72,371.00	\$71,896.47	\$71,683.00
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	2	Tribe	\$61,487.00	\$31,087.50	\$30,883.66	\$30,399.50
<b>Washington</b>						
Washington Department of Ecology (Mitigation)	1	State	\$65,549.00	\$33,118.50	\$32,901.34	\$32,430.50
The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	1	Tribe	\$207,760.00	\$104,224.00	\$103,540.61	\$103,536.00
Tulalip Tribes	1	Tribe	\$158,927.00	\$79,807.50	\$79,284.21	\$79,119.50
Washington Department of Ecology (Regulatory)	1	State	\$241,047.00	\$120,867.50	\$120,074.98	\$120,179.50
Stillaguamish Tribe	1	Tribe	\$57,298.40	\$28,993.20	\$28,803.09	\$28,305.20
Quinault Indian Nation	2	Tribe	\$241,665.00	\$121,176.50	\$120,381.95	\$120,488.50
Nooksack	1	Tribe	\$43,777.00	\$22,232.50	\$22,086.72	\$21,544.50
<b>SUM</b>			<b>\$2,098,732.40</b>	<b>\$1,054,870.20</b>	<b>\$1,047,953.48</b>	<b>\$1,049,366.20</b>
Original Allocation			\$2,107,875.00	\$1,054,875.00		\$1,053,000.00
0.6% rescission for FY15				\$6,916.76		
<b>New Allocation</b>			<b>\$2,100,958.24</b>	<b>\$1,047,958.24</b>		<b>\$1,053,000.00</b>

\*FY15 funding total minus the rescission based on the June 19, 2015 Memorandum, FY 2015 Rescission Guidance, issued by Carol Terris and Howard Corcoran.

Enclosures: Evaluation Criteria  
Project Justifications

## Evaluation Criteria

Applicants for Track One projects will be evaluated against each other based on the Track One criteria and applicants for Track Two projects will be evaluated against each other based on the Track Two criteria. There will be separate selection lists for each track.

### **Track One: Evaluation Criteria for TRACK ONE Applicants – states and tribes**

<p>1) National Priority Area: Wetland Program Development and WPPs (10 points)</p>	<p>Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the applicant:</p> <p>Proposes to develop a WPP consistent with the objectives and guidelines described in Section I. C, PRIORITY AREAS AND TRACK CONCEPT, of this announcement. In addition, if applicable, the proposal will also be evaluated to the extent it describes one or more core elements(s) and associated action(s) (see the CEF at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/cefdevelop/">http://www.epa.gov/cefdevelop/</a>) that the applicant proposes to carry out.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Describes which grant-eligible actions from an EPA-approved WPP the applicant proposes to carry out and how they will do so.</p>
<p>2) Project Need (15 points)</p>	<p>Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the applicant demonstrates the need for the project as it pertains to developing or refining a state/tribal/local government wetland program. The description should include: the threats affecting your wetlands/streams; the need for the particular actions you are proposing; and how the deliverables will lead to an increase in the quality and quantity of wetlands. Describe specific aspects of your area and specific adverse issues your wetlands face and how this issue will be addressed by the development of a WPP or through the core element/action you have described in Section IV.C.3.B.1 National Priority Area.</p>
<p>3) Regional Priority Areas (5 points)</p>	<p>Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the proposed project supports one or more of the Regional Priorities identified in Section I.C.2, REGIONAL PRIORITY AREAS, of this announcement.</p>
<p>4) Project Tasks (15 points)</p>	<p>Under these criteria, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they demonstrate a description of the steps you will take to meet the project product/output(s) and objective(s) including a clear description of project tasks and associated products and whether the applicant's approach (methodology) or the steps they propose is sound.</p>
<p>5) Milestone Schedule (10 points)</p>	<p>Under these criteria, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they provide a clearly articulated milestone schedule that covers each year of the entire grant period. Including a breakout of the project tasks into phases with associated tasks and products. Including the anticipated dates for the start and completion of each task. Provide interim milestone dates for achieving each workplan component. In addition,</p>

	including a clearly articulated approach to ensure that awarded funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner.
6) Budget (10 points)	Under these criteria, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they demonstrate the adequacy of the information provided in the detailed budget and whether the proposed costs are reasonable and allowable including whether: the applicant identified the requested federal dollars and the total project cost <b>for each component/task</b> for each budget item from Form 424A; the applicant explained if and how non-federal partners will provide cost share/match and demonstrated the cost-effectiveness and reasonableness of costs and the value of in-kind contributions.
7) Transfer of Results (10 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well they demonstrates the applicant's plan for active transfer of project results (outputs/outcomes), lessons learned, and/or methods to other states, tribes, or local governments agencies within and beyond their own organization, so that the others can better build their wetland programs.
8) Environmental Results: Outputs, Outcomes and Tracking (20 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well they demonstrate each of the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Outputs and Outcomes– the extent and quality to which the proposal demonstrates potential environmental results, anticipated outputs and outcomes, and how the outcomes are linked to EPA's Strategic Plan Goal of working with partners achieving a net increase in wetland acres. (10 points)</li> <li>ii. Tracking – The extent and quality to which the proposal demonstrates a sound plan for tracking progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes. (10 points)</li> </ul>
9) Programmatic Capability/Technical Experience/Qualifications (10 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on the applicant's ability to successfully manage and complete the proposed project taking into account their: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Organizational experience related to the proposed project, and their infrastructure and their readiness and ability to implement the proposed project in a successful and timely manner. (5 points)</li> <li>ii. Staff experience/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources, or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project. (5 points)</li> </ul>
10) Partnerships (10 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the applicant has demonstrated appropriate and necessary partnerships as described in Section IV.C.3.B.9, Partnership Information.
11) Past Performance (10 points)	Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account their: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C of the announcement (4 points),</li> <li>ii. history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C of the announcement including whether they submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements, (3 points) and</li> <li>iii. the extent and quality to which they adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected</li> </ul>

	<p>outputs and outcomes under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C of the announcement and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not (3 points).</p> <p>Note: In evaluating applicants under these criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these subfactors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.</p>
--	---

**Track Two: Evaluation Criteria for TRACK TWO Applicants – states, tribes, local governments, interstate agencies, intertribal consortia, and universities that are agencies of a state**

1) National Priority Area: Wetland Program Development (10 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the proposed project addresses the core element(s) and one or more action(s) under a core element to develop or refine a state/tribe/local government's wetland program either through the program development/refinement actions in the CEF (located in the CEF at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/cefdevelop/">http://www.epa.gov/cefdevelop/</a> ) or from the grant-eligible actions in an existing EPA-approved WPP (if the applicant is a local government, interstate agency, intertribal consortium, or university).
2) Project Need (15 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the applicant demonstrates the need for the project as it pertains to developing or refining a state/tribal/local government wetland program. The description should include: the threats affecting your wetlands/streams; the need for the particular actions you are proposing; and how the deliverables will lead to an increase in the quality and quantity of wetlands. Describe specific aspects of your area and specific adverse issues your wetlands face and how this issue will be addressed through the core element(s)/action(s) you have described in Section IV.C.3.B.1 National Priority Area.
3) Regional Priority Areas (5 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the proposed project supports one or more of the Regional Priorities identified in Section I.C.2, REGIONAL PRIORITY AREAS, of this announcement.
4) Project Tasks (15 points)	Under these criteria, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they demonstrate a description of the steps you will take to meet the project product/output(s) and objective(s) including a clear description of project tasks and associated products and whether the applicant's approach (methodology) or the steps they propose is sound.
5) Milestone Schedule (10 points)	Under these criteria, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they provide a clearly articulated milestone schedule that covers each year of the entire grant period. Including a breakout of the



	project tasks into phases with associated tasks and products. Including the anticipated dates for the start and completion of each task. Provide interim milestone dates for achieving each workplan component. In addition, including a clearly articulated approach to ensure that awarded funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner.
6) Budget (10 points)	Under these criteria, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they demonstrate the adequacy of the information provided in the detailed budget and whether the proposed costs are reasonable and allowable including whether: the applicant identified the requested federal dollars and the total project cost <b>for each component/task</b> for each budget item from Form 424A; the applicant explained if and how non-federal partners will provide cost share/match and demonstrated the cost-effectiveness and reasonableness of costs and the value of in-kind contributions.
7) Transfer of Results (10 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well they demonstrates the applicant's plan for active transfer of project results (outputs/outcomes), lessons learned, and/or methods to other states, tribes, or local governments agencies within and beyond their own organization, so that the others can better build their wetland programs.
8) Environmental Results: Outputs, Outcomes and Tracking (20 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well they demonstrate each of the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Outputs and Outcomes– the extent and quality to which the proposal demonstrates potential environmental results, anticipated outputs and outcomes, and how the outcomes are linked to EPA's Strategic Plan Goal of working with partners achieving a net increase in wetland acres. (10 points)</li> <li>ii. Tracking – The extent and quality to which the proposal demonstrates a sound plan for tracking progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes. (10 points)</li> </ul>
9) Programmatic Capability/Technical Experience/Qualifications (10 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on the applicant's ability to successfully manage and complete the proposed project taking into account their: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Organizational experience related to the proposed project, and their infrastructure and their readiness and ability to implement the proposed project in a successful and timely manner. (5 points)</li> <li>ii. Staff experience/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources, or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project. (5 points)</li> </ul>
10) Partnerships (10 points)	Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the applicant has demonstrated appropriate and necessary partnerships as described in Section IV.C.3.B.9, Partnership Information.
11) Past Performance (10 points)	Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account their: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C of the announcement (4 points),</li> </ul>



	<p>ii. history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C of the announcement including whether they submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements, (3 points) and</p> <p>iii. the extent and quality to which they adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C of the announcement and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not (3 points).</p> <p>Note: In evaluating applicants under these criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these subfactors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.</p>
--	--

**WETLAND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GRANTS FY 2015**  
**Project Justifications**

**Track 1 Projects Recommended for Funding:**

**Alaska**

**Chilkat Indian Village** – *Klukwan Wetland Program Plan Capacity Development Grant*

EPA funding: \$ 114,564  
Match:       \$ 38,850  
Total:       \$ 153,414

The Chilkat Indian Village (CIV) is seeking EPA funding to develop a Tribal Wetland Program Plan (WPP). The CIV owns approximately 2,000 acres of land in the Chilkat River Watershed; the traditional territory of the Chilkat Indian Village spans from north of the Canadian border to Berners Bay. The main tasks carried out under this award will be facilitating capacity building trainings; researching and writing a WPP; and developing appropriate monitoring, mapping, and data collection mechanisms to implement climate change monitoring and other specific activities under the EPA core element framework. The following main products will be developed within the award period: development of a Klukwan WPP; development of Monitoring and Assessment strategies, program and protocols that address how to identify wetlands and streams vulnerable to climate change; and development of methods and demonstration training projects to address species and habitats of subsistence significance that are at risk from changes or loss of wetlands and streams due to climate change.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal is in line with the program's goals to develop a WPP in line with the Core Element Framework and to incorporate monitoring and tracking for climate change as one of the components. The threats to the resources are clearly articulated and the need and uses for the WPP are also clearly articulated.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* There is a reliance on hired contractors to perform many of the tasks written and it's difficult to assess the quality of the contractors or consultants as details were not provided.

**Idaho**

**Idaho Department of Fish and Game** – *Idaho's Large-river Floodplain Forested Wetlands: Assessing and mapping distribution, threats, conditions, function, and restoration opportunities*

EPA funding: \$ 137,000  
Match:       \$ 61,142  
Total:       \$ 198,142

Large-river floodplain wetlands, especially cottonwood forests, are highly threatened by human land uses and climate change. IDFG proposes to develop, test, and calibrate a rapid assessment method designed to estimate the condition, function, and long-term viability of these habitats. We will also map the distribution of Idaho's floodplain forested wetlands and describe reference conditions for both

minimally disturbed and altered river reaches. Results of the assessment testing will, in part, be used to prioritize river reaches in need of protection, maintenance, enhancement, or restoration. Specific activities for protecting or restoring floodplain forested wetlands will be described for high priority river reaches.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* Proposal involves 5 WPP actions relating to two Core Elements (Monitoring and Assessment and Voluntary Restoration). Clearly states the threat of the resource, the need for the project, and how monitoring and assessment for climate change is a priority for these resources.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* The proposal is fairly aggressive and the applicant has required time extensions for many of their projects in the past. Additionally, the transfer of results is passive and could be improved upon.

## **Oregon**

### **Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribes of Indians** – *Wetland Condition Assessment for Prioritizing Restoration Projects on Cow Creek Umpqua Tribal Lands*

EPA funding: \$ 36,748  
Match:       \$ 4,520  
Total:         \$ 41,268

Protecting, enhancing, and restoring wetlands within the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indian's (the Tribe) ancestral territory is vital to revitalizing the Cow Creek culture, maintaining lifeways, and sustaining a connection to the land. The Tribe has been working over the last two years to identify areas where wetland associated ecosystems are located within the Tribe's ancestral territory. Having a better understanding of the location and condition of these wetland resources will help in prioritizing which areas need protection, enhancement, and restoration. Through this funding application, the Tribe proposes to complete one year of monitoring at four selected sites on tribal lands to better understand the limiting factors of each of these wetland sites. Data collected will better coordinate the Tribe's efforts in the future to restore and protect them for ecological, cultural and economic purposes. The two core elements that the Tribe will be focusing on are 1) Monitoring and Assessment and 2) Voluntary Restoration and Protection. The final product will be a report on the condition of these four wetland sites with a list for actions to be completed to restore, protect and enhance culturally important plants. The Tribe will be working with key partners on this project and will be sharing the results to advance the study of wetland science in the Pacific Northwest.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal is following their WPP and describes the need for the work well. There is a strong development of partnerships within the proposal.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* They are proposing a relatively small number of sites relative to the size of the area of interest. The technical transfer is passive and informal, could be improved to be more direct.

### **Siletz Tribes – Siletz Tribes’ WPP**

EPA funding: \$ 50,000  
Match:           \$ 0  
Total:           \$ 50,000

This project will allow for the construction of the Tribe’s first WPP covering the full Siletz Basin 5<sup>th</sup> field HUC. The project focuses on the partnership led by The Wetlands Conservancy and the Tribe but encompasses other State, Federal, County, and NGO partners. The partner’s main work will involve developing a coordinated landscape scale ecological framework to assist in prioritizing the conservation and restoration needs and opportunities for the Siletz Basin. Other areas of focus will include examining the datasets associated with the Oregon Explorer wetlands classification and status GIS based tool. The partners will be working to evaluate how well the tool has classified Siletz Basin wetlands, what edits need to be made, and how those classifications relate to tribal needs specific to species recovery and cultural preservation. The requested funds will support development of the Tribe’s first WPP. Specific to the EPA’s CEF, two objectives will be addressed within the new WPP. The objectives will fall within the CEF Monitoring and Assessment and Voluntary Restoration and Enhancement categories.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* This proposal is in line with the national priority to develop a WPP. The proposal discusses engaging external partners which will help the long-term success of the program. Through the project, they’re bringing training to tribal staff which will further develop the tribe to carry out the program.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* The milestone schedule was difficult to follow and will need improvement. The qualifications were not described well and therefore it was difficult to assess their ability to carry out the project.

### **Oregon Department of State Lands - Completion of an Aquatic Resources Mitigation Program for Oregon Work Plan**

EPA funding: \$ 348,647  
Match:           \$ 239,855  
Total:           \$ 588,502

The State of Oregon has a mature regulatory program that continues to move toward a functions based, watershed-scale approach for managing and regulating wetlands and streams. This proposal contains three interdependent projects that will result in an Aquatic Resources Mitigation Program for Oregon. The projects are a result of collaboration between the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL), Environmental Protection Agency Region 10 (EPA), US Army Corps of Engineers Portland District (Corps), and the Willamette Partnership (hereafter referred to as the interagency “Project Team”) to develop the mitigation framework necessary for a functions-based, watershed-scale approach to mitigation for aquatic resources in Oregon. The proposal will build upon substantial work already completed by these agencies to provide the necessary tools and develop the policies and processes to implement the mitigation framework.

**Project #1 – Stream Function Assessment Method (SFAM):** Completes the efforts currently underway to develop a function assessment for Oregon streams and to incorporate the tool into the functions-based mitigation framework.



**Project #2 –SFAM Reporter tool development :** Creates online tools that provide access to data and protocols to apply SFAM, allows SFAM field data to be shared with regulators, and provides needed information for stream mitigation and restoration improvements.

**Project #3 - Steps necessary to administer the new mitigation program protocols:** Allows DSL staff and partners to build internal capacity and develop processes and effectively implement new wetland and stream mitigation protocols and policies to t apply a functions-based, watershed-scale approach to mitigation for wetlands and streams in Oregon.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal includes three projects in one and has a strong match of 40% from ODSL and their partners which shows a strong degree of support for the work.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* Due to combining three projects into one proposal, there is a lack of detail for each project regarding tasks, milestone schedule, and detailed budget.

## **Washington**

### **Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation - WPP Development Activities on the Colville Reservation FY 16-FY17**

EPA funding: \$ 207,760

Match: \$ 23,084

Total: \$ 230,844

This proposal includes program building activities identified in CTCR’s EPA-approved Wetland Program Plan (WPP) listed above, including review/update of the WPP in 2017. Tasks include wetland assessment and monitoring, wetland mapping in areas of land development, creating and distributing wetland information, conducting training, updating Tribal code wetland protections, developing landscape level wetland mapping, updating wetlands monitoring strategy and QAPP. Products will include assessment and water quality data, wetland workshops and information for staff and community; updated Shoreline Management code; wetland maps for urban development areas; updated wetland monitoring strategy, QAPP, and WPP. The grant funds one full time position, the CTCR wetland specialist, for two years in order to carry out this work.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal is well-organized and includes a good description of need and threats to the resources. It also includes a good description of the climate change priority for this RFP.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* Ambitious schedule for two years. It seems that the scope of work and timeline could be expanded on in the final application.

### **Tulalip Tribes of Washington – 2015-2019 Wetland Program Implementation**

EPA funding: \$158,927

Match: \$ 17,697

Total: \$176,624

The Tulalip Natural and Cultural Resources Department (TDNR) proposes to implement two priority actions identified in the EPA approved 2013 Tulalip Tribes Wetland Program Plan including validation, calibration, and implementation of the first reservation wetland monitoring and assessment strategy; and development of the first “State of the Tulalip Reservation Watersheds” report to identify and communicate baseline environmental (emphasis on aquatic resources) conditions on the reservation to Tribal staff and members.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal is following elements of the approved WPP. The proposal is for the logical next steps for wetland program development for the tribe.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* Transfer of results appears to be aimed internally only, the budget doesn’t line up.

**Stillaguamish Tribe** – *Stillaguamish Tribe Wetland Program Plan - Monitoring and Assessment Strategies and Preliminary Condition and Function Data Collection*

EPA funding: \$ 57,298.40 (partial funding; requested \$300,265)  
Match:            \$ 12,600.90  
Total:            \$ 69,899.30

Wetlands help maintain and improve the water quality of streams, rivers, lakes and estuaries. Additionally, wetlands perform functions such as providing fish and wildlife habitat, flood reduction and erosion control among many others. In order to be successful in protecting and restoring this Tribally valuable resource into the future, the Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians proposes to further develop and carryout the activities described in the Tribe’s EPA approved Wetland Program Plan. Project objectives are; developing a monitoring and assessment strategy document and using the methods described in the aforementioned document, to conduct preliminary condition and function data collection on one or two wetlands of interest on Stillaguamish Tribal Land.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal was explained well and included a good connection to the climate change regional priority. The proposal follows the intentions of the newly approved wetland program plan.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* The scope of work for the monitoring work was unclear and would need to be elaborated on for the final application.

**Washington Department of Ecology** – *Guide on Wetland Mitigation in Washington State: Improving environmental outcomes in wetland management*

EPA funding: \$65,549  
Match:            \$21,850  
Total:            \$87,399

Applicants proposing to affect wetlands are subject to regulation on the federal, state and local levels. In cases where the three levels of government do not agree or, worse yet, have conflicting requirements, the applicant is stuck in the middle and the permit process drags out. Various permit streamlining initiatives have identified the need for clear standards so that applicants know what is needed and the agencies get adequate information from the applicant.

This project proposes to develop wetland mitigation guidance that reflects changes in wetland science, policy and regulation. In 2006, Ecology, the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), and EPA developed a joint guidance and policy document on compensatory mitigation. This guidance is outdated and inconsistent with current regulatory conditions and policies. Updates in wetland science, court cases, and the revision of federal requirements and their approach to compensatory mitigation have occurred over the last eight years. During that same time, Ecology developed a series of technical tools for improving wetland regulation and mitigation and updated the wetland rating systems to reflect the current state of the science.

The proposed guidance will describe these changes in regulation and descriptions and uses of these tools. Development of the guidance would include coordination with the Corps and EPA, state agencies, local governments, and tribes, with public review of the document. Project results will be disseminated through notices and presentations to state and federal agencies, local governments including at planners' forums, Ecology's website and our wetlands email listserv.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* There are good partnerships working together for this project and it shows a clear capacity building effort for the applicant since they are using in-house staff to complete the work.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* Detail was lacking in many areas including the budget, milestone schedule, and how progress would be tracked.

**Washington Department of Ecology** – *Improved Wetland Identification for Conservation and Regulatory Priorities*

EPA funding: \$149,080 (full funding)  
Match:        \$ 49,693  
Total:         \$198,773

The ability to identify and characterize wetlands is paramount to effectively protect and successfully restore these valuable resources. This project will improve our ability to more efficiently and accurately identify the location, size, and type of Washington's (WA) wetland resource. This will be accomplished using remote sensing data to identify (digitally map) wetland locations and classify wetland types.

Ecology will develop a systematic process that will result in an updated, statewide map of wetland locations, with attributes covering multiple classification schemes including Cowardin, NWIPlus LLWW (landscape position, landform, water flow path, and waterbody type), WA HGM classes, WA Natural Heritage types, and Level 1 Ecological Integrity Assessment (EIA). For Phase One of this project, we will determine the most efficient and accurate statewide approach for remotely mapping and classifying wetlands. We will apply the approach in two areas representative of land use and ecological diversity of WA. This will allow us the opportunity to estimate the accuracy of mapping in areas where unique challenges have contributed to errors in existing maps (e.g., densely forested areas, agricultural areas, slopes, and aridlands). Future phases will focus on applying the approach in additional watersheds and counties in priority order based on criteria established in Phase One.

Project results will be available as a publicly accessible, web-based map. Information about the maps, and any analyses using the data, will be disseminated through articles and presentations to state and federal agencies, local governments and planners' forums, on Ecology's web page, and through Ecology's wetlands listserv.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* Proposal was clear and consistent with their approved Wetland Program Plan. The project also has consensus among partners that it is a top priority for the state's wetland program.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* The budget needs more details, specifically the breakdown of their matching contributions. The proposal was weak in the description for how the results will be used in the future.

## Track 2 Projects Recommended for Funding:

### Alaska

**Alaska Natural Heritage Program** – *Wetlands across Alaska: providing a statewide wetland map and assessment of rare wetlands in Alaska*

EPA funding: \$ 100,209  
 Match: \$ 33,403  
 Total: \$ 133,612

The vast size of Alaska has precluded detailed wetland mapping at the statewide scale. While several wetland maps have been produced for the state, the resolution of either their mapping (Whitcomb et al. 2009, 100 m) or classification (Jin et al. 2013, two wetland classes) is too coarse to allow meaningful regional-scale assessment and monitoring. The Alaska Natural Heritage Program (AKNHP) has inferred wetland distribution on a statewide scale using landcover class as a proxy for wetland type. We now seek funding to refine this map, perform an accuracy assessment using plot data from the National Wetland Inventory, produce metadata and develop an online service for the content. In addition to providing the distribution of wetland systems in accordance with classification proposed by Cowardin et al. (1979), we propose to assess, describe and map the distribution of rare wetlands for Alaska.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The connection to the Core Element Framework is described well. The tasks, outputs, and outcomes are also described well. The project is clearly building state-wide capacity for the wetland and aquatic resources program.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* No connection to the developing Alaska WPP was mentioned in the proposal. There are no described partnerships with the end-users of the results of this project and therefore it's difficult to understand how, exactly, the results will be used.

### Idaho

**Coeur d'Alene Tribe** – *Coeur d'Alene Tribe Wetland Program Development: Developing Tools for Monitoring, Assessment, and Restoration*

EPA funding: \$ 90,000  
 Match: \$ 0  
 Total: \$ 90,000



The Coeur d'Alene Tribe proposes to conduct Coeur d'Alene Tribal Wetland Program development building actions and activities over a 1-year period. If funded, the Tribe's main tasks and final products would be: 1) Conducting at least 4 intra- Tribal Wetland Workgroup meetings for coordination and collaboration, 2) Conducting a 2 wetland functional assessment training for Coeur d'Alene Tribal staff (and possibly other tribes) on the Coeur d'Alene Reservation, 3) A map of the Coeur d'Alene Reservation that compares historic stream channels to current stream channel configurations, and 4) A summary of the Coeur d'Alene Tribal strategy and process for ground-truthing Coeur d'Alene Reservation wetlands as compared to wetlands identified in the National Wetland Inventory maps.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal builds from a draft wetland program plan that will be submitted for approval in the next few months. The proposal contains training for staff to build their capacity. Climate change is described well within the proposal too.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* The results of the project will not be made available to the public, limited the transfer of results. More description for the tasks and methods used will be necessary for the final application.

## **Oregon**

### **Lane Council of Governments** – *Finalizing Oregon Rapid Assessment Protocol for Local Planning*

EPA funding: \$ 144,054  
Match:       \$ 55,960  
Total:       \$ 200,014

Finalizing Oregon Rapid Wetland Assessment Protocol for Local Planning (ORWAP-LP) will establish a statewide assessment protocol which is useful for: ongoing natural resource management at every jurisdictional level; cross-program application; tracking wetland condition and extent over time in the face of climate change; informing the statewide regulatory framework; and providing tools to local jurisdictions for successful program design and implementation. Main tasks are: 1) Develop supplemental ORWAP-LP version worksheets; 2) Characterize climate change impacts on wetlands; 3) Develop ORWAP-LP guide for local jurisdictions; 4) Develop web based ORWAP-LP guide and toolkit; 5) Provide rulemaking assistance on determination of wetland significance. Products: 1) Report discussing feasibility of different ORWAP values and functions for cross program analyses and ORWAP-LP worksheets/reports for program assessment and planning; 2) Climate change impacts report, case study and white paper on key climate change tools and considerations for local land managers; 3) ORWAP-LP guide and dissemination package; 4) Web site and web based toolkit; 5) Review of rule iterations, facilitated focus groups, and stakeholder involvement package.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* Good overall proposal, tie to the Core Element Framework, and link to climate change. The organization has a good history with carrying out EPA grants and has good capacity to complete this project.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* The proposal was not clear if the results would be transferred to other counties within Oregon.

### **Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation** – *R 10 Tribal Wetland Working Group (TWIG) - Transition to the Future*

EPA funding: \$ 61,487  
Match:       \$ 20,531  
Total:       \$ 82,018

This effort seeks to continue work begun in 2009, at the EPA sponsored meeting in Spokane, WA, to build the organizational capacity of R. 10 Tribal wetland programs. Specifically, we seek to build the technical and organizational capacity of Tribal Wetland Programs in EPA Region 10 through the Tribal Wetlands Working Group (TWIG) by: 1) continuing to host Workshops of the EPA Region 10, Tribal Wetlands Working Group throughout the PNW, 2) provide training opportunities for Tribal staff on wetlands and aquatic resources, 3) distribute documentation of TWIG activities and events to the R. 10 Tribes and 4) develop a leadership transition plan for the TWIG. Additionally, we will continue to help develop a Tribal specific component to the EPA, Core Elements Framework. During this project period, we intend to build on our outreach to Tribes throughout R. 10, particularly to Villages in Alaska, incorporate climate change planning efforts by Tribes into our workshops and emphasize emerging

GIS/remote sensing technologies as applied to wetland assessments and characterizations. Also, we will continue to explicitly consider the patterns of Tribal use to aquatic landscapes throughout R.10.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal is responsive to the needs of the tribes within Region 10, particularly the inclusion to assist Alaskan Native Villages as well as the tribes within the lower three states of the region. The transition of leadership is necessary and shows forward thinking for the TWIG.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* The proposal was poorly written for the goals of the Wetland Program Development Grant, for instance, not all evaluation criteria were included in the proposal. While outreach to Alaska Native Villages is mentioned, the explanation of how this will take place is missing from the proposal.

### Washington

#### Quinault Indian Nation - *Developing a Quinault Wetland Program and Assessing Climate Vulnerability*

EPA funding: \$ 241,665  
Match: \$ 0  
Total: \$ 241,665

This 21-month project will build the Quinault tribal wetland program by undertaking knowledge-building activities in accordance with the QIN's *Wetland Program Plan*. Five outputs will be delivered: 1) a climate change vulnerability assessment for reservation wetlands to guide future adaptation planning, 2) a five-year wetland monitoring strategy to assess wetland hydrology and habitat conditions, 3) a Quinault ethnobotany guidebook to build community support for land acquisition and restoration, 4) training sessions conducted by professional wetland scientists to improve staff knowledge of wetland characteristics and function, and 5) a new Wetland Specialist position to ensure staff time is devoted year-round to wetland issues. This project will result in science-based decision-making based on improved data and increased understanding of wetland structure and function. Ultimately the project supports the EPA's Strategic Objective to protect and restore watersheds and aquatic ecosystems with a particular focus on coastal wetlands.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal was well-written with good clarity and detail for the approach that is intended to be used. The description of need and the relation to climate change was also good. The proposal outlines the key next steps to build the program's capacity for a wetland program.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* Ambitious schedule for less than two years. Due to the reliance of contractors for several tasks, it is unclear if capacity will be retained with the tribal staff.

**Nooksack Indian Tribe** – *Advanced Wetlands Mapping and Restoration Potential Characterization to Mitigate for Water Temperature Exceedances due to Legacy Impacts and Climate Change to facilitate the temperature TMDL for the South Fork Nooksack River*

EPA funding: \$ 44,777 (partial funding of the original request of \$125,000)

Match: \$ 0

Total: \$ 43,777

The South Fork Nooksack River (SFNR) has suffered from legacy impacts caused by land use. Climate change on top of legacy impacts will cause significant cumulative impact on the ability of the river to be resilient in the face of climate change. Wetlands on the SFNR floodplain have a direct role in maintain the integrity of the river. Wetlands on the river's floodplain have been highly degraded and/or eliminated. Wetland restoration is known to have the potential to ameliorate existing temperature exceedances as well as address future continued climate change impacts. This proposed project will address both the 303(d) TMDL regulatory program applied to the SFNR as well as the recommendations made in the EPA-ORD-lead SFNR temperature TMDL/climate change pilot research project. This project will include advanced wetlands identification and mapping, functional assessment, and restoration potential. This proposed project directly acts on EPA Region 10's regional priorities that focus on the role that wetlands play in maintaining ecosystem resilience to climate change and also the recommendations made in the 303(d) TMDL regulatory program applied to the SFNR as well as the recommendations made in the EPA-ORD-lead SFNR temperature TMDL/climate change pilot research project.

- *Strengths of the proposal:* The proposal has a clear connection to climate change and is an example to use this grant program to inform and work with the TMDL program.
- *Weaknesses of the proposal:* The proposal contained a brief mention of the Core Element Framework, but does not describe how the work would inform or develop a wetland program. The first task of three proposed tasks is recommended for funding as it is the task that is in line with the goals of the WPDG program and is a foundation to build upon for future program development.

**Projects not recommended for funding:**

**Track 1:**

**Idaho**

**Nez Perce Tribe** – *Tracking, assessment, and regulatory tools to increase Nez Perce Wetland Program's Capacity*

The proposed project followed the activities listed in years four and five of the Nez Perce Tribe's (NPT) approved Wetland Program Plan, in accordance with the four "core elements of an effective tribal wetlands program framework." The proposal listed many tasks without a clear and strategic path forward to develop the Nez Perce wetland program. The panel felt that the proposal lacked direction which is the main reason the proposal was not recommended for funding. Additionally, the review



panel scored this proposal low for various criteria including the project purpose and need, the connection to climate change, and several issues with the budget.

### Washington

**Washington Department of Natural Resources** - *Field Guide to Washington's Wetland Types. An Essential Tool for Identification, Conservation Assessment, and Categorization*

WNHP proposes to fine-tune content development undertaken in previous grants and work with University of Washington Press, a leading nonprofit scholarly publisher of the Pacific Northwest, to publish a field guide facilitating accurate identification of wetlands and riparian areas as classified by WNHP. The review panel agreed that this proposal did not describe the connection to the state's approved WPP aside from listing the WPP by name only. The transfer of results of the project would only be through passive distribution and purchase of the book. The majority of the budget is for production of the book and the panel did not feel that this was the best use of WPDG funding. While *this* proposal was ranked higher than the proposal for the Siletz Tribe's proposal, the review panel took into account geographic diversity and diversity of projects and agreed that this proposal should not receive funding while the Siletz Tribe's proposal should receive funding.

**Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation** - *Developing a Wetlands Program Plan for the Chehalis Tribes*

The proposal is for the development of a Wetland Program Plan for the Chehalis Tribes. The proposal did not make any connections to the Core Element Framework and did not contain a description of how the WPP and any of the work under the proposal would improve and build the tribe's capacity. The majority of the work would be conducted by a contractor and there was no description of transferring that knowledge to tribal staff to build internal capacity. Overall, the proposal is not recommended for funding, but it is recommended that ARU staff debrief to discuss Wetland Program Plans in terms of program development and capacity building for the tribe.

### **Track 2:**

### Alaska

**University of Alaska Anchorage, Kachemak Bay Research Reserve** - *Incorporating nitrogen sources linked by groundwater flowpaths important for wetland and headwater stream aquatic productivity*

This proposal is based in a scientific study to link the groundwater flowpath from wetlands to streams. The proposal is a very unique research proposal but poorly links to the focus of this grant program. There is little discussion of transfer of results to build program capacity and no connection to the Alaska Wetland Program Plan in development. The approach was very technical which made it hard to assess for quality and appropriateness of methods. The budget was very high and included travel costs for researchers from Florida and for samples to be analyzed in Florida. Overall, the grant review panel concurred that this project should not be funded through the WPDG this year.

**Alaska Department of Natural Resources** - *Developing a Comprehensive Alaska Wetland Inventory*

This proposal was for the development of a wetland work group for Alaska as well as the state-wide wetland inventory and mapping work. The wetland workgroup development was funded under the 2013 WPDG to ADEC and therefore the review panel did not believe that portion of the project should be funded. Additionally, the proposal did not include any partnerships or consensus from other state agencies and did not make the connection with the state's developing WPP. The project also seemed very ambitious to map the state's wetlands and there were doubts that it could be completed in the specified timeframe. Additional issues with the proposal were the lack of budget detail and milestone schedule as well as a high (over 50%) indirect rate.

**Municipality of Anchorage** - *Analysis of Development Threat and Enhancement, Restoration, or Creation Opportunities for Municipality of Anchorage Wetland Parcels*

While the need for this project was good and it tied into the regional priority of climate change, the overall proposal was poorly written and it seemed that the proposal's narrative did not follow the introduction directly. The tasks did not line up with the need statement nor the budget for the task. The budget table did not contain much detail and the categories did not line up with the narrative descriptions. The budget also did not contain information on how the amounts for various sections were derived which made it difficult to assess. The connection to mitigation banking was not clear in the proposal. Additionally, water quality standards were mentioned in the introduction but were not linked in the proposal narrative.

**Alaska Railroad Corporation** - *Skookum Glacier Alluvial Fan Hydrologic Study*

The Alaska Railroad Corporation worked with EPA to prove that they are an entity of the state and therefore are eligible to submit an application for funding under this RFP. The proposal was for a hydrologic study for glacial wash that has routinely interfered with a specific railroad line. The need was related to the railroad's infrastructure more so than the development of a wetland and aquatic resources program. The proposal did connect well to the regional priority of climate change, however, it did not make adequate connections to the Core Element Framework and did not discuss how the results of the project would develop or refine the state's wetland program. The proposal provided weak descriptions of the tasks and of the budget making it difficult to evaluate. Overall, the project was not in line with the WPDG goals and in light of the limited funding under Track 2, this proposal was not recommended for funding.

Note: This should be attached to the selection documentation that is included in the competition section of the funding recommendation.

### CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT FOR SELECTION OFFICIALS

I, Linda Anderson-Carnahan, certify to the best of my knowledge and belief, that I am not aware of any information, facts, or circumstances bearing on the existence of any potential or actual conflicts of interest that would affect, impair, or influence my ability to make selections for award under announcement number EPA-REG10-15-16 in an impartial, fair, and objective manner in accordance with the stated evaluation criteria. If such a conflict of interest materializes during performance of my responsibilities as selection official, I will immediately notify and make a full disclosure to the EPA official who delegated me authority to select financial assistance recipients and the Agency's Grants Competition Advocate and not continue to serve as selecting official for this competition until the conflict of interest can be mitigated, resolved, or avoided

Linda Anderson-Carnahan Anderson-Carnahan 6/23/15

Print name

Signature

Date